

Derivation of $m_A \simeq M_Z$ and $\tan \beta > \sqrt{3}$ in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model

Ernest Ma

*Department of Physics
University of California
Riverside, California 92521*

Abstract

In the minimal supersymmetric standard model, the Higgs sector has two unknown parameters, usually taken to be $\tan \beta \equiv v_2/v_1$ and m_A , the mass of its one physical pseudoscalar particle. By minimizing the minimum of the Higgs potential along a certain direction in parameter space, it is shown that $m_A = M_Z + \text{radiative correction}$, and if one further plausible assumption is made, $\tan \beta > \sqrt{3}$.

If there is physics beyond the standard $SU(2) \times U(1)$ electroweak gauge model, supersymmetry is generally considered to be an excellent candidate. The minimal supersymmetric standard model[1] must then have two scalar doublets $\Phi_1 = (\phi_1^+, \phi_1^0)$ and $\Phi_2 = (\phi_2^+, \phi_2^0)$, with Yukawa interactions $(\overline{u}, \overline{d})_L d_R \Phi_1$ and $(\overline{u}, \overline{d})_L u_R \tilde{\Phi}_2$ respectively, where $\tilde{\Phi}_2 = i\sigma_2 \Phi_2^* = (\overline{\phi_2^0}, -\phi_2^-)$. Hence the mass matrix for quarks of charge $-1/3$ (*i.e.* d , s , and b) is proportional to the vacuum expectation value $\langle \phi_1^0 \rangle \equiv v_1$, and that for quarks of charge $2/3$ (*i.e.* u , c , and t) is proportional to $\langle \phi_2^0 \rangle \equiv v_2$. There are two unknown parameters in the Higgs sector of this model. They are usually taken to be $\tan \beta \equiv v_2/v_1$ and m_A , the mass of its one physical pseudoscalar particle. Numerous phenomenological studies[2] have been made using these as continuous variables. However, there is a plausible theoretical argument for $m_A = M_Z$ at tree level and perhaps also $\tan \beta > \sqrt{3}$, as shown below.

The Higgs potential of the minimal supersymmetric standard model is given by[3]

$$\begin{aligned} V = & m_1^2 \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 + m_2^2 \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 - m_{12}^2 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 + \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1) \\ & + \frac{1}{8} (g_1^2 + g_2^2) [(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)^2 + (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2)^2] \\ & - \frac{1}{4} (g_1^2 - g_2^2) (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1) (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) - \frac{1}{2} g_2^2 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where g_1 and g_2 are the $U(1)$ and $SU(2)$ gauge couplings respectively. Let V be broken spontaneously, then

$$m_1^2 - m_{12}^2 v_2/v_1 + \frac{1}{4} (g_1^2 + g_2^2) (v_1^2 - v_2^2) = 0, \quad (2)$$

and

$$m_2^2 - m_{12}^2 v_1/v_2 + \frac{1}{4} (g_1^2 + g_2^2) (v_2^2 - v_1^2) = 0. \quad (3)$$

Hence

$$m_1^2 + m_2^2 = m_{12}^2 (\tan \beta + \cot \beta), \quad (4)$$

and

$$v_1^2 + v_2^2 = \frac{-4m_1^2 \cos^2 \beta + 4m_2^2 \sin^2 \beta}{(g_1^2 + g_2^2)(\cos^2 \beta - \sin^2 \beta)}. \quad (5)$$

There are five physical scalar particles with masses given by

$$m_A^2 = m_1^2 + m_2^2, \quad (6)$$

$$m_{H^\pm}^2 = M_W^2 + m_A^2, \quad (7)$$

and

$$m_{H_1^0, H_2^0}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left[M_Z^2 + m_A^2 \pm \sqrt{(M_Z^2 + m_A^2)^2 - 4M_Z^2 m_A^2 \cos^2 2\beta} \right], \quad (8)$$

where

$$M_W^2 = \frac{1}{2} g_2^2 (v_1^2 + v_2^2) \quad (9)$$

and

$$M_Z^2 = \frac{1}{2} (g_1^2 + g_2^2) (v_1^2 + v_2^2) \quad (10)$$

are the squares of the masses of the W and Z bosons.

The part of V involving only neutral fields depends on four parameters: m_1^2 , m_2^2 , m_{12}^2 , and $g_1^2 + g_2^2$. At its minimum V_0 , we can choose to keep m_1^2 and m_2^2 , but replace m_{12}^2 by $\tan \beta$ through Eq. (4) and $g_1^2 + g_2^2$ by $v_1^2 + v_2^2$ through Eq. (5). In that case,

$$V_0 = \frac{1}{2} (v_1^2 + v_2^2) (\cos^2 \beta - \sin^2 \beta) (m_1^2 \cos^2 \beta - m_2^2 \sin^2 \beta). \quad (11)$$

We now seek to minimize V_0 in parameter space. This is a reasonable procedure in that whatever dynamical mechanism is responsible for the soft breaking of supersymmetry, it may well be such that the lowest possible value of V_0 is automatically chosen. It is also clear that $v_1^2 + v_2^2$, m_1^2 , and m_2^2 set the energy scale of the symmetry breaking and V_0 has no lower bound as a function of these parameters. We should therefore consider them as fixed and vary $\sin^2 \beta$ to minimize V_0 . Let $x \equiv \sin^2 \beta$, then

$$\frac{\partial V_0}{\partial x} = \frac{1}{2} (v_1^2 + v_2^2) \left[-(3m_1^2 + m_2^2) + 4(m_1^2 + m_2^2)x \right], \quad (12)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_0}{\partial x^2} = 2(v_1^2 + v_2^2)(m_1^2 + m_2^2). \quad (13)$$

Hence the minimization of V_0 is achieved if

$$x = \frac{3m_1^2 + m_2^2}{4(m_1^2 + m_2^2)} \quad (14)$$

and $m_1^2 + m_2^2 > 0$ which is consistent with Eq. (6). Using Eq. (5), we then find

$$m_1^2 + m_2^2 = \frac{1}{2}(g_1^2 + g_2^2)(v_1^2 + v_2^2), \quad (15)$$

or equivalently

$$m_A = M_Z. \quad (16)$$

This implies

$$m_{H^\pm} = (M_W^2 + M_Z^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \simeq 121 \text{ GeV} \quad (17)$$

and

$$m_{H_1^0, H_2^0} = M_Z(1 \pm \sin 2\beta)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (18)$$

From Eq. (14), we find

$$\tan^2 \beta = \frac{3m_1^2 + m_2^2}{m_1^2 + 3m_2^2}, \quad (19)$$

which shows that if $m_1^2 > 0$ and $m_2^2 > 0$, then $1/\sqrt{3} < \tan \beta < \sqrt{3}$. However, because Φ_2 couples to the t quark with a large Yukawa coupling, m_2^2 is expected to differ from m_1^2 by a large negative contribution from the renormalization-group equations,[4] hence the case $m_1^2 > 0$ and $m_2^2 < 0$ should be considered. We then obtain

$$\tan \beta > \sqrt{3}, \quad (20)$$

where $m_1^2 > 3|m_2^2|$ has also been assumed or else V_0 would have been minimized at $\sin^2 \beta > 1$ which is impossible. Using Eq. (18), we find $m_{H_1^0} > 33 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{H_2^0} < 125 \text{ GeV}$, with the constraint that $m_{H_1^0}^2 + m_{H_2^0}^2 = 2M_Z^2$. Experimentally, there is no evidence for the existence of any of the five scalar particles of the minimal supersymmetric standard model from Z decay or in any other process. Detailed phenomenological analyses[2] have concluded that

for $m_A = M_Z$, $\tan \beta > \sqrt{3}$ is allowed. The only possible exception is from the experimental upper bound on the process $b \rightarrow s\gamma$, which excludes m_A up to 130 GeV according to one calculation.[5] However, another calculation[6] gives a value which is roughly 20% lower, in which case $m_A = M_Z$ and $\tan \beta > \sqrt{3}$ are again allowed for $m_t \leq 150$ GeV.

Using Eq. (5), we could also have written Eq. (11) in the more familiar form

$$V_0 = -\frac{1}{8}(g_1^2 + g_2^2)(v_1^2 + v_2^2)^2 \cos^2 2\beta. \quad (21)$$

This means that if we were to fix $g_1^2 + g_2^2$ and $v_1^2 + v_2^2$, the minimization of V_0 would occur at either $\sin \beta = 0$ ($v_2 = 0$) or $\cos \beta = 0$ ($v_1 = 0$). Note that because of Eq. (5), we could not have also kept both m_1^2 and m_2^2 fixed. Whereas this solution does indeed correspond to a local minimum along a particular direction in parameter space, it is clearly not acceptable phenomenologically. It also requires m_{12}^2 to be zero which is perhaps not so acceptable theoretically. As it is, we have discovered another direction (and arguably the only one) along which V_0 is minimized with both v_1 and v_2 nonzero.

If the Yukawa coupling of the t quark to Φ_2 is large, there is also a significant radiative contribution to the $(\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2)^2$ term in the Higgs potential V of Eq. (1). This generates an extra term in Eq. (3). In that case, Eq. (7) remains valid but Eq. (8) is modified so that in principle $m_{H_2^0} > M_Z$ would be possible.[7] Here we find

$$m_A^2 \simeq M_Z^2(1 + \delta_1), \quad (22)$$

and

$$m_{H_1^0, H_2^0}^2 \simeq M_Z^2 \left(1 + \delta_2 \pm \sqrt{(1 + \delta_1) \sin^2 2\beta + \delta_2^2} \right), \quad (23)$$

where

$$\delta_1 = \left(\frac{3 - 2 \sin^2 \beta}{2 \sin^2 \beta - 1} \right) \delta, \quad \delta_2 = \delta + \frac{1}{2} \delta_1, \quad (24)$$

and

$$\delta = \frac{3g_2^2 m_t^4}{16\pi^2 M_W^2 M_Z^2 \sin^2 \beta} \ln \frac{\tilde{M}^2}{m_t^2}, \quad (25)$$

$\tilde{M}$ being an effective mass for the scalar supersymmetric partners of the t quark and $\tilde{M}^2 \gg m_t^2$ has been assumed.

In conclusion, it has been shown in this note that $m_A = M_Z$ (+ radiative correction) and $\tan \beta > \sqrt{3}$ are plausible results in the minimal supersymmetric standard model. The key theoretical assumption is that the minimum V_0 of the Higgs potential V should be also a local minimum in parameter space along a certain direction. Specifically, if we fix m_1^2 , m_2^2 , and $v_1^2 + v_2^2$, then V_0 is minimized at tree level with $\tan^2 \beta = (3m_1^2 + m_2^2)/(m_1^2 + 3m_2^2)$, resulting in $m_A = M_Z$. However, radiative correction due to a large value of m_t changes that to $m_A \simeq M_Z(1 + \delta_1)^{1/2}$ as given by Eq. (22). If we assume further that $m_1^2 > 0$ but $m_2^2 < 0$ because of a large negative contribution from the renormalization-group equations, then $\tan \beta > \sqrt{3}$ is also obtained.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author acknowledges the indispensable help of V. Barger in clarifying the current phenomenological situation with regard to $\tan \beta$ and m_A . This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AT03-87ER40327.

References

- [1] For a review, see for example H. E. Haber and G. Kane, *Phys. Rep.* **117**, 75 (1985).
- [2] See for example V. Barger, K. Cheung, R. J. N. Phillips, and A. L. Stange, *Phys. Rev.* **D46**, 4914 (1992); H. Baer, M. Bisset, D. Dicus, C. Kao, and X. Tata, *ibid.* **D47**, 1062 (1993).
- [3] See for example J. F. Gunion and H. E. Haber, *Nucl. Phys.* **B272**, 1 (1986).
- [4] See for example H. P. Nilles, *Phys. Rep.* **110**, 1 (1984).
- [5] V. Barger, M. S. Berger, and R. J. N. Phillips, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison Report No. MAD/PH/730 (November 1992) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, in press.
- [6] J. L. Hewett, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (Feb 22, 1993).
- [7] Y. Okada, M. Yamaguchi, and T. Yanagida, *Phy. Lett.* **B262**, 54 (1991); *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **85**, 1 (1991); H. E. Haber and R. Hempfling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 1815 (1991); J. Ellis, G. Ridolfi, and F. Zwirner, *Phys. Lett.* **B257**, 83 (1991); R. Barbieri, M. Frigeni, and F. Caravaglios, *ibid.* **258**, 167 (1991); A. Yamada, *ibid.* **263**, 233 (1991).